



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

but it is shared in by few other archaeologists. Again: the author also denies the connection of the Antenor base and the female figure which stands upon it in the Acropolis Museum. There is a chance here for an honest difference of opinion, but if Dr. von Mach could compare a cast of the top of the base with the lower part of the statue perhaps he would be more ready to believe that the two belong together.

One misses a chapter on the Sidon sarcophagi, and another on the Attic grave reliefs, but the author no doubt wishes to confine himself as far as possible to the works of the great masters. The chapter on material, technique, etc., might be enlarged with profit without materially increasing the size of the book.

In this book Dr. von Mach has done a real service to the study of Greek art. Students of archaeology are too apt to forget artistic appreciation in the discussion of archaeological detail. This the book aims to correct, and in this it differs from other available handbooks. It thus has a field of its own.

The misprints are few. Note 'Reissner', page 325 and in the index, for 'Reisner'. Errors in proper names are especially irritating.

WILLIAM N. BATES.

1. Asser's Life of King Alfred, together with the Annals of St. Neots erroneously ascribed to Asser. Edited, with introduction and commentary, by WILLIAM HENRY STEVENSON, M. A. Oxford, at the Clarendon Press, 1904. cxxxi, 386.

We at last have a critical edition of Asser's Life of King Alfred, which Mr. Stevenson pronounces "one of the great *desiderata* of our early historical literature". An introduction of 131 pages is followed by the text of 96 pages. Then comes an appendix of 50 pages containing the Annals of St. Neots,—20 pages of introduction and 30 of text,—followed by about 200 pages of Notes on Asser's Life of King Alfred and 40 pages of an index of proper names. After a very thorough and laborious study of the work Mr. Stevenson's conclusion is stated as follows in the Preface (p. vii): "The net result has been to convince me that, although there may be no very definite proof that the work was written by Bishop Asser in the lifetime of King Alfred, there is no anachronism or other proof that it is a spurious compilation of later date". The introduction comprises the following sections: 1. History of the text; 2. Description of the lost MS; 3. The transcripts; 4. Excerpts from the work in later compilers; 5. The author, Internal evidence of the text; 6. The attacks upon the authenticity of the work; 7. Summary.

The work is full of interpolations, made by Archbishop Parker, chiefly from the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle and the Annals of St. Neots, one of the most noted of which is the familiar story of

"the cakes", taken from the Annals of St. Neots. Mr. Stevenson calls this "the most famous of the passages foisted into the Life by Parker" (p. 256), of which he says: "More mischief has been wrought by Parker's interpolation of this long passage than by any of his other falsifications of historic evidence". Mr. Stevenson is sustained in his view of the genuineness of the Life by Pauli and Ebert vs. Wright and others, and he has devoted some thirty pages to a consideration of the charges that have been brought against the work. He says: "We have thus examined the charges brought against the Life, and we have not found one dealing with facts that support the view that the work is of later origin than it pretends to be"; and further: "In the course of a microscopical examination of the work we have failed to discover anything that can be called an anachronism". . . . "This absence of anachronism is an argument in favour of the authenticity of the work". Neither Pauli nor Ebert thinks that the Life has come down to us in its original form, but Mr. Stevenson considers that "both writers are probably influenced in part by the gross interpolations of Parker". He gives the date of composition of the Life as "six years only before the death of the King", i. e., 895 A. D., and says that there are "several features that point to its being composed at least as early as the first half of the tenth century", and that are "compatible with an earlier date". The unique Cottonian MS was entirely destroyed in the great fire of 1731; "the oldest hand dated from about the year 1000 or 1001", and "the later hand cannot have been later in date than the eleventh century". Francis Wise published a facsimile of the MS in 1722, nine years before the fire, and this is our chief authority for the text. He had the authority of the noted scholar, Humphrey Wanley, for the date, and it was he that "assigned the first and earliest hand of the MS to about the year 1000 or 1001", as given above. Archbishop Parker bequeathed a transcript to Corpus Christi College, Cambridge,—the most valuable one,—and there are other transcripts in the British Museum, in the Cambridge University Library, and in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge.

Mr. Stevenson states that "the text has been established by a minute collation of the existing transcripts and editions and of the early compilers who embody matter derived from this work", the most valuable of whom is Florence of Worcester (died A. D. 1118), then the author of the so-called Annals of St. Neots,—*not* Asser,—who slavishly copied his originals, then Simeon of Durham. Mr. Stevenson has evidently done his work very carefully and thoroughly, and in such manner that it will not need to be done over again. Scholars are greatly indebted to him for rehabilitating Asser.

Because of the relation of the Annals of St. Neots to the Life of Alfred, Mr. Stevenson prints the text of that work, and prefixes an introduction treating "1. Character of the work;

2. Origin of name; 3. Probably an East Anglian compilation; 4. Date of compilation; 5. Use of Frankish sources; 6. English sources; 7, 8. Version of O. E. Chronicle employed; 9-11. Relations with Florence of Worcester; 12. Compiler does not use William of Malmesbury or Geoffrey of Monmouth; 13. Use of the work by later compilers; 14-16. Description of unique MS; 17. Early transcripts; 18. Previous editions".

The passages drawn from the *Life of Alfred* and other well-known sources are merely indicated, and these, with the translations from the O. E. Chronicle, "constitute by far the greater part of the work". "Nothing is known of the compiler or of the date or place of the compilation". The work is not continued beyond A. D. 914, and the use of Norman sources proves that it is later than the Conquest, probably later than the year 1104. "The English sources used in the compilation are Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica*, the Chronicle, the *Life of Alfred*, Abbo of Fleury's '*Passion of St. Edmund*', a life of St. Æthelberht, King of East Anglia, and a life of St. Neot. The text of the latter has not come down to us, but the verses quoted from it occur in a twelfth-century MS life of this saint". These are the verses quoted in the *Life of Alfred* containing the excoriation of the King by the cowherd's wife in the matter of "the cakes",—referred to above,—and run as follows (p. 41 of the *Life*):

"Heus homo

urere, quos cernis, panes gyrare moraris,  
cum nimum gaudes hos manducare calentes".

It is a pity that we do not know the name of the author of these hexameters, for a literary reputation has sometimes been based on much less foundation.<sup>1</sup>

The compiler of these *Annals* "makes extensive use of the *Life of Alfred*, embodying nearly the whole of it". Only one MS of the work is known, formerly belonging to Archbishop Parker, and at present in the library of Trinity College, Cambridge. A transcript made for the use of Parker is among his MSS at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, and an edition was printed from the Trinity College MS at Oxford in 1691 by Thomas Gale, hence its rarity deserved this reprint.

2. *The Making of English*. By HENRY BRADLEY. New York and London. The Macmillan Company, 1904.

The title of this book is attractive, and when introduced by the name of Dr. Henry Bradley, one of the editors of the *Oxford English Dictionary*, it was reasonable to expect that we at last had an elementary text-book on its subject which could be confidently commended to school-teachers. I regret to have to say that the result is disappointing. This may be due, in part,

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Stevenson says that "we have no evidence of the existence of this story of Alfred and the cakes before the Norman Conquest."

as Dr. Bradley says in his Preface, "to the desultory manner in which it has been composed", but the only answer to such an excuse is that it was not necessary to compose it. It would take too much space in this Journal to enumerate specific objections. Even "educated readers unversed in philology",—for whom it is intended,—should have a more scientific and systematic treatment of the subject than we find here. It does not lessen the difficulties of a subject to ignore scientific order and arrangement, and to throw together "desultory" essays, however true may be the statements made in them.

It is scarcely correct, from the standpoint of modern philology, to say (p. 35): "Old English had many declensions of substantives". This is going back to the days of Rask and his followers. To say nothing of German and American studies, it disregards the works of Dr. Morris, Professor Skeat, and Mr. Sweet. Too much is made of "the complicated system of strong verbs", and the statement is made that "it remains just as intricate as it was in Old English". It is easily enough understood if it is arranged on a scientific system, but where no help is given to understand it, no wonder it is called "complicated" and "intricate".

In the chapter on "Word-Making in English", many illustrations are drawn from "made-up" words, as *fairation* (p. 137), *dodder* (p. 159), etc., but these are scarce in actual English. The "general reader", ignorant of the subject, may be edified by this book, but the teacher will find it hard to use the book in instruction.

JAMES M. GARNETT.